

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July 28, 2005.

Claims 1-6, 11-15, 40, 41, 47-51 and 57-61 are pending in the application. The Examiner issued a restriction requirement as follows:

**Group I:** Claims 40, 41, 47 - 51 and 57 – 61 drawn to receiving a definition of a reverse star schema meta-model, receiving a definition of at least one customer profile group, generating a data warehouse populated with information from a source database, receiving input, receiving a definition of a data model, dynamically creating a generated database, and displaying a portion of the dynamically generated database, classified in class 707, subclass 100.

**Group II:** Claims 11-15 drawn to receiving a definition of a customer profile group, creating a list of customers for the customer profile group, creating customer classification components, creating a first dimension table based upon the data model, and creating a fact table based upon the data model, classified in class 707, subclass 1.

## **Restriction Requirement**

In response to the Restriction Requirement mailed June 28, 2005, for purposes of examination, Applicant herein elects to prosecute Group I, Claims 1-6, 40, 41, 47 - 51 and 57 - 61 without traverse. Applicants withdraw Claims 11 – 15 without prejudice. In the event that generic claim is allowed, Applicants reserve the right to file additional claims directed toward the subject matter of the generic claim. Applicants also reserve the right to file divisional applications including withdrawn claims.

## **Rejection under 35 U.S.C § 101**

In item 3, the office action maintained the rejection of claims 47 – 51 under the 35 U.S.C. §101 as non-statutory, asserting that “the claims as presented do not claim a technological basis in the body of the claim,” and citing Ex parte Bowman. Applicant would traverse, since the

embodiments in the specification are described with reference to computing hardware and associated software, but elects instead to amend claims 47 in order to obviate the rejection and expedite allowance. Claims 48 – 51 depend from claim 47 and therefore incorporate this limitation by virtue of this dependence.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

In item 4, of the previously mailed office action, mailed December 29, 2004, this Examiner stated that claims 6, 11, 15 and 61 are allowed. The office action also indicates that claims 1 – 5, 12 – 14, 40, and 57 - 60 will be allowable when the claim objections are overcome, and that claims 47 – 51 will be allowable when the 35 USC 101 rejection is overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 41, also in the elected group, should also be allowed for the reasons stated above.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time that may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Paul A. Durdik  
Reg. No. 37,819

Dated: November 21, 2005.

**Customer No. 23910**  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800 x227  
Fax: (415) 362-2928